

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/864,093	05/21/2001	Gerald R. Clark	70651	1812	
22242 7:	590 03/03/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY			PHAN, HANH		
120 SOUTH LA SUITE 1600	A SALLE STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL	60603-3406		2638		
			DATE MAILED: 03/03/2006	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. Supplemental	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/864,093	CLARK ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	-				
	Hanh Phan	2638					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 09 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.					
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compart following time periods: The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the first prior of of the first p	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The replaced of the final rejection.	ffidavit, or other evidence, whi compliance with 37 CFR 41.3 y must be filed within one of tl	ich 1; or he				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have							
been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension fee under final Office action; or (2) as set fort	er 37 th in (b)				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS							
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a 	ensideration and/or search (see NO ow); tter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally re	TE below); educing or simplifying the issu	es for				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment (PTOL-	324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>9 and 19</u> would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling							
the non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: 9 and 19. Claim(s) rejected: 1-8, 10-18 and 20-50. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ worlded below or appended.	ill be entered and an explanat	ion of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence is necess	sary				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fails to pro See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	be vide a				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:							
See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments to claims 1, 5-8, 10-12, 16-18, 20-22, 24-29, 31-35, 38-43 and 46-50 are not persuasive. The independent claims 1, 12, 20, 29, 35 and 43 are now amended to include the limitation of "wherein the step of converting the fiber interface fundamental wavelength of the first optical signal to a free space fundamental wavelength is performed all-optically without using electro-optical conversion, and wherein the step of converting the free space fundamental wavelength of the second optical signal to a fiber interface fundamental wavelength is performed all-optically without using electro-optical conversion" and the applicant argues that the cited references (Medved et al and Geiger) fail to teach such limitation. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Geiger teaches in Figure 1 that using an optical parametric oscillator (OPO) for converting a fiber interface fundamental wavelength of a first optical signal to a free space fundamental wavelength is performed all-optically without using electro-optical conversion and using an optical parametric amplifier (OPA) for converting a free space fundamental wavelength of a second optical signal to a fiber interface fundamental wavelength is performed all-optically without using electro-optical conversion (see column 3, lines 20-56). Therefore, it is believed that the limitations of claims 1, 5-8, 10-12, 16-18, 20-22, 24-29, 31-35, 38-43, and 46-50 are still met by the combination of Medved, Geiger, Ransford and Kumar and the rejection is still maintained.

HANH PHAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER